



The Municipality of
Port Hope

Municipality of Port Hope
56 Queen Street, P.O. Box 117
Port Hope ON L1A 3V9

REPORT TO: General Government and Finance Committee

FROM: Barbara Spry, Treasurer

SUBJECT: September 25, 2007

DATE: 2006 Municipal Performance Measurement Program
Results

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that the General Government and Finance Committee receive the 2006 Municipal Performance Measurement Program Results for information purposes and the results be posted on the Municipal website.

BACKGROUND:

The Province of Ontario requires municipalities to report specific performance measurements to the public and within their annual Financial Information Return (FIR). These measurements are calculated based on expenditures reported in the annual FIR and statistical information provided by staff and the Province.

The Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) was designed to provide taxpayers with information on service delivery in core municipal service areas. Performance measures can be used as a tool to measure change in service delivery and identify opportunities for economic and/or efficiency improvements. Appendix A summarizes the MPMPs for Port Hope, including commentary on the results.

The Ministry of Municipal Affairs (MMAH) compiles the results provided by all municipalities and prepares a report showing the median of all municipalities. The Ministry's report, however, is always two years behind the current results reported by municipalities and therefore not considered a useful tool when comparing Port Hope's 2006 MPMP results to the median results. The completed MMAH 2004 Summary is available for viewing in the Finance Department and also on the MMAH website (www.mah.gov.on.ca).

It is very difficult, if not impossible, to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiencies of one municipality against another based on the information provided in the Financial Information Return. There are many factors that affect the results and all of these factors must be taken into consideration when comparing one municipality to another. A Municipality must strive to improve its results compared to its own past experience and taking into account any changing circumstances.

CONCLUSION:

The Municipality has a legislative requirement through the Municipal Act, 2001, to prepare and communicate annual performance measures to the local taxpayers. To comply with the Municipal Act this report will be posted on the Municipal website and a copy sent to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing for information.

Original Signed by:

Barbara Spry, Treasurer

**Municipality of Port Hope
2006 Municipal Performance Measures**

1. Core Area: General Government

Measure: Local Government Operating costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of the total municipal operating.

Objective: Efficient municipal government.

Results:

Local Government	2006	2005
Operating costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of total municipal operating	7%	6%

Explanation of Variance: The operating costs for the governance and corporate management include the new Human Resources position in 2006.

Factors that will affect the results when comparing to other municipalities:

- Salary for Councillors and whether they are full-time or part-time.
- Programs/services to which Local Government costs are allocated.
- Method used to allocate program/service support costs.

2. Core Area: Fire Services

Measure: Operating costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment.

Objective: Efficient fire services.

Results:

Fire Services	2006	2005
Operating costs for fire services per \$1,000 of assessment	\$0.68	\$0.89

Explanation of Variance: Increase in assessment by \$147 million has decreased the operating costs per \$1,000 of assessment.

Factors that will affect the results when comparing to other municipalities:

- Total assessment for the Municipalities as well as size, service area/service level, and the urban/rural mix.
- Composition of the fire fighting force such as salary, volunteer, full-time, part-time or a combination as well as the cost for standby services and number of call outs.
- Joint service agreements with neighbouring municipalities.
- Incidents of specific types of fires such as structural and wild land fires.
- Age of the equipment that is being used. (maintenance costs)
- Emergency operations are part of the fire services budget.
- Additional services the fire department is providing (fire prevention, public education, first response medical service, etc.)

3. Core Area: Police Services

Measures: Operating costs for police services per person and crime rate per 1,000 persons.

Objective: Efficient and effective police services.

Results:

Police Services (combined)	2006	2005
Operating costs for police services per person	\$255	\$230
Violent crime rate per 1,000 persons	10	10
Property crime rate per 1,000 persons	39	30
Total crime rate per 1,000 persons (Criminal code Offences excluding traffic)	55	49
Youth crime rate per 1,000 youth (estimate only)	71	72

Comments: The Municipality of Port Hope's measure includes the Port Hope Police and the OPP contract.

Factors that will affect the results when comparing to other municipalities:

- Whether the OPP service is reported as a contracted service or an external transfer. Expenditures reported as external transfers are not part of the operating cost formula.
- The service area and population.
- Range and level of services provided such as patrol, community relations, crime prevention, etc)
- Dispatch service allocations to other departments. The Port Hope Dispatch service percentage allocation is 30% to Roads and 10% to Fire and currently being reviewed.
- Higher incidents of more complex crimes which will require additional resources.
- Demographics and population density.
- Transient populations such as commuters and tourists.
- Urban and rural mix as well as business and residential mix.
- Preventive and educational programs and community involvement and partnerships.

4. Core Area: Transportation

Measure: Percentage of paved lane kilometers rated adequate

Objective: Efficient and effective municipal road maintenance services.

Results: **The Municipality of Port Hope does not allocate the costs by paved and unpaved roads. The costs have been allocated based on % of lane kilometer.**

Roads	2006	2005
Operating costs for paved (hard top) roads per lane kilometre.	\$4,715	\$4,116
Operating costs for unpaved (loose top) roads per lane kilometre.	\$4,666	\$4,062
Operating costs for winter maintenance of roadways per lane kilometre maintained in winter.	\$710	\$1,046
Percentage of paved lane kilometres where the condition is rated as good to very good.	31%	29%
Percentage of winter events where the response met or exceeded locally determined municipal service levels for road maintenance	100%	100%

Explanation of Variance: The operating costs for roads increased in 2006 and include materials, salaries and benefits, contracted services and equipment maintenance and repairs. The operating costs for winter maintenance (plowing, sanding, etc.) were less than in 2005.

Factors that will affect the results when comparing to other municipalities:

- Financial reporting practices such as allocating costs for paved and unpaved roads.
- The type (arterial, local, residential) and number of lane kilometers in the municipality.
- Accuracy of the estimated number of lane kilometers as well as the width of the lanes and inclusion of sidewalks.
- Traffic volumes and the type of traffic (transports, etc).
- Climate resulting in freezing and thawing.
- Changes in fuel prices, labour, contract costs for road maintenance.

When comparing the percentage of paved lane kilometers where the condition is rated as good to very good the results are influenced by:

- Municipal budget and service level decisions.
- Whether a sample or all the lane kilometers are tested and the method used (visual, estimate or a formal rating system).
- Types of roads.

5. Core Area: Transit

Measures: The operating costs per regular service passenger trip and number of passenger trips per person in the year.

Objective: Efficient transit services and effective utilization of the services.

Results:

Transit	2006	2005
Operating costs for transit per service passenger trip. (estimated # of trips based on revenue)	\$4.86	\$4.41
Number of transit passenger trips per person in the service area in a year.	3	3

Explanation of Variance: Increased contract costs for the conventional and Mobiltrans as well as repairs and maintenance for the municipally owned Mobiltrans buses.

Factors that will affect the results when comparing to other municipalities:

- Rider ship is estimated or counted. Currently in Port Hope this is estimated.
- Service levels such as number of routes, hours of operating, etc.
- Population density
- Age of the fleet.
- Contracted service or operated by the Municipality.

6. Core Area: Wastewater – The Municipality of Port Hope costs include both collection and treatment.

Measures: Operating costs for the collection of wastewater per kilometer of main.

Operating costs for the treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre.

Number of wastewater main backups per 100 kilometres of wastewater main in a year.

Objective: Efficient municipal wastewater services and management practices to prevent environmental and human health hazards.

Results:

Wastewater (Sewage) - Municipality's costs include collection and treatment	2006	2005
Operating costs for the collection of wastewater per kilometre of wastewater main.	\$9,005	\$8,405
Operating costs for the treatment and disposal of wastewater per megalitre	\$470	\$436
Number of wastewater main backups per 100 kilometres of wastewater main in a year.	19	23
Percentage of wastewater estimated to have by-passed treatment	2.76%	5.98%

Explanation of Variance: Increase operating costs for the Wastewater Plant and Sewage system.

Factors that will affect the results when comparing to other municipalities:

- System is combined or reported separate.
- Population and density of the service area.
- Precipitation and severity of storm events as well as the extent of water infiltration.
- Type of treatment as well as the level.
- Operating cost increases.
- Errors in the calculation.
- Age, condition and size of the system.

7. Core Area: Water Treatment and Distribution

Measures: Operating costs for the treatment of drinking water per megalitre.

Operating costs for the distribution of drinking water per kilometer of water distribution pipe.

Weighted number of days when boil water advisory was issued by the Medical Officer of Health.

Number of water main breaks per 100 kilometres of water distribution pipe.

Objective: Efficient treatment and distribution of drinking water and to ensure the water is safe and meets local needs.

Results:

Drinking Water	2006	2005
Operating costs for the treatment of drinking water per megalitre	\$395	\$300
Operating costs for the distribution of drinking water per kilometre of water distribution pipe.	\$5,684	\$3,337
Weighted number of days when a boil water advisory issued by the Medical Officer of Health, applicable to a municipal water supply, was in effect.	0	0
Number of water main breaks per 100 kilometres of water distribution pipe in a year.	10	8

Explanation of Variance: In 2005 the reporting of the kilometers of water distribution pipe included the connections and hydrants for a total of 137 kilometres of pipe, whereas for 2006 the measure was based on 94 kilometers of pipe excluding connections and hydrants.

Factors that will affect the results when comparing to other municipalities:

- The recording of treatment and distribution are segregated.
- Age and condition of the plants and pipes.
- Type of usage (commercial, industrial, residential).

8. Core Area: Parks and Recreation

Measure: Operating costs for parks, recreation programs and recreation facilities per person.

Objective: Efficient operation of the parks, recreation programs and recreation facilities.

Results:

Parks and Recreation	2006	2005
Operating costs for parks per person.	\$25.35	\$23.50
Operating costs for recreation programs per person.	\$28.89	\$26.93
Operating costs for rec. facility per person.	\$71.40	\$65.53
Operating costs for parks, recreation programs and recreation facilities per person.	\$125.64	\$115.95
Total participant hours for recreation programs per 1,000 persons	20,132	22,107
Hectares of open space	132	131
Hectares of open space per 1,000 persons	8	8
Total kilometres of trails	17	16
Total kilometres of trails per 1,000 persons	1.04	0.97
Square metres of recreation facility space.	12,512	12,505
Square metres of recreation facility space per 1,000 persons.	763	760

Explanation of Variance: Increased operating costs such as salaries and benefits, materials, utilities, maintenance and repairs of facilities and other structures.

Factors that will affect the results when comparing to other municipalities:

- Number and type of outdoor spaces in the parks.
- Number and type of programs.
- If there is volunteer involvement and to what extent.
- Number and type of recreation facilities and whether the facilities serve the region as well as the local citizens.

9. Core Area: Libraries

Measure: Operating costs for libraries per person and uses per person.

Objective: Efficient library services and to increase the use of the library services.

Results:

Libraries	2006	2005
Operating costs for libraries per person.	\$35.14	\$33.97
Operating costs for libraries per use.	\$2.13	\$2.46
Library uses per person.	17	7
Electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses.	11%	3%
Non-electronic library uses as a percentage of total library uses.	89%	97%

Explanation of Variance: Increase in the operating costs for salaries and benefits and utilities.

Factors that will affect the results when comparing to other municipalities:

- Whether the Municipality has its own library or purchases the service on a contract basis from another library.
- Municipality is a member of a union public library or the Upper-tier has a library which provides the service and the rational used to allocate the costs.
- Types of services being offered.

10. Core Area: Land Use Planning

Measures: Percentage of new lots, blocks and/or units with final approval which are located within the settlement areas.

Percentage of land designate for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses during the reporting year and relative to the base year of 2000.

The number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses during the reporting year and since January 1, 2000.

Objective: Effective preservation of agricultural land as well as lot creation in the settlement areas.

Results:

Land Use Planning	2006	2005
Percentage of new lots, blocks and/or units with final approval which are located within the settlement areas.	80%	92%
Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses during the reporting year.	100%	100%
Percentage of land designated for agricultural purposes which was not re-designated for other uses relative to the base year of 2000.	100%	100%
Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses during the reporting year.	0	0
Number of hectares of land originally designated for agricultural purposes which was re-designated for other uses since January 1, 2000.	0	0

Explanation of Variance: N/A

Factors that will affect the results when comparing to other municipalities:

- Whether the municipality has an official plan and/or designated settlement areas.
- The availability of land for new development and whether there is designated agricultural land.
- Annexation and/or amalgamation occurred.
- The demand for new development
- Crown Land